

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 11, 16 and 27. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims are supported by the application as originally filed and do not contain any new matter. Accordingly, the Office Action will be discussed in terms of the claims as amended.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-27 under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Martin et al. '371, stating that Martin et al. '371 discloses a coin inspection apparatus comprising an exciting coil arranged in the vicinity of one side of a coin passage, a receiving coil arranged in the vicinity of the one side of the coin passage so as to be electromagnetically coupled with the exciting coil, oscillating means for exciting and oscillating the exciting coil at a predetermined frequency to produce an electromagnetic field, first detecting means for detecting at least one of amplitude, frequency and phase of an oscillation voltage of the exciting coil, second detecting means for detecting an electromotive force signal generated in the receiving coil, discriminating means for discriminating authenticity of the thrown coin based on detection from the first and second detecting means and discriminating authenticity based on a combination of an electromotive force signal detected by said receiving coil and amplitude, frequency or phase of an oscillation voltage of said exciting coil.

In reply thereto, Applicant would like to incorporate by reference his comments made in prior responses by Applicant concerning Applicant's invention and Martin et al. '371. In addition, Applicant would like to point out that Martin et al. '371 merely discloses exciting a plurality of induction coils at different frequencies and detecting changes of frequencies of the induction coil when the coin passes by the induction coils. The induction coils serve as exciting coils and also as detection coils for detecting the frequency change, but do not serve as receiving coils for detecting a surface irregularity pattern of the thrown coin based on the electromotive force produced therein. Still further, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Martin et al. '371 of arranging the detection coil separately from the exciting coil.

In contrast to Martin et al. '371, in Applicant's invention the authenticity of a thrown coin is discriminated by a combination of the detection of at least one of amplitude, frequency and phase of the oscillation voltage of the excitation coil for determining the material of the thrown coin and the detection of the electromotive force produced in the receiving coil arranged separately from the exciting coil for determining a surface irregularity pattern of the thrown coin.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Martin et al. '371 does not show each and every element of Applicant's invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-27 are not obvious over Martin et al. '371.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-27 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Martin et al. in view of Rawics-Szczerbo et al., stating that Martin et al. discloses each and every element of Applicant's invention but fails to expressly disclose details of using eddy currents to detect surface patterns of coins; Rawics-Szczerbo et al. discloses using eddy currents to detect surface patterns of coins; and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Martin et al. in view of the teachings of Rawics-Szczerbo et al.

In reply thereto, Applicant would like to incorporate by reference his comments above concerning Applicant's invention and Martin et al. In addition, Applicant has carefully reviewed Rawics-Szczerbo et al. and respectfully submits that it does not disclose the use of eddy currents for detecting the surface irregularity patterns of a coin. In particular and in contrast thereto, in Applicant's invention the eddy currents detected are only dependent upon the surface pattern embossed in the coin. In contrast thereto, in Rawics-Szczerbo et al. the frequency and amplitude of the oscillation produced on line 15 deviates as a result of changes in impedance as the coin passes therethrough. The changes in impedance occur as a result of the skin effect type eddy currents being induced in the coil by the coin and the magnitude of the frequency and amplitude deviations are dependent upon several factors, including the relative sizes of the coil in the coin, the coin diameter and thickness, the metal from which the coin is made and the surface pattern embossed in the coin (see col. 3, line 61-col. 4, line 10 of Rawics-Szczerbo et al.). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Rawics-Szczerbo et al. does not disclose that the surface irregularity pattern of the coin would be detected by means of the eddy current.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination suggested by the Examiner is not Applicant's invention and claims 1-27 are not obvious over Martin et al. in view of Rawics-Szczerbo et al.

Applicant further respectfully and retroactively requests a one month extension of time so as to respond to the Office Action. Please charge Deposit Account 11-1445 in the sum of \$110.00 as the fee.

In view of the above, therefore, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered, favorably considered and the case passed to issue.

Please charge any additional costs incurred by or in order to implement this Amendment or required by any requests for extensions of time to KODA & ANDROLIA DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 11-1445.

Respectfully submitted,

KODA & ANDROLIA

By: 

William L. Androlia
Reg. No. 27,177

2029 Century Park East
Suite 1430
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3024
Tel: (310) 277-1391
Fax: (310) 277-4118

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office Fax No. (703) 872-9326 on September 4, 2003.

William L. Androlia
Name _____

Signature Date
9/4/2003